after the election is over you will publish the names of those who gave the money to buy the election. If publicity has any virtue in this world, it is to give to the voters the names of those that are back of the candidacy and contributing to the election of the respective men asking the suffrage of the people. Publish the names and amounts of those who contribute. Let this be done before the election. Let the voter with ballot in hand have the opportunity to see the forces that are furnishing the campaign boodle. Let the man who, around a cheerless and humble fireside, almost shivers in the cold see if the coal trust is contributing to one of the candidates. (Applause.) Let the ballot holder in his cottage or cabin in which no light scarcely ever burns see if the oil trust is furnishing money to one of the parties. (Applause.) Let the ragged man whose family, scantily clad, left at home when he goes in to cast his ballot see if the wool trust, the clothing trust, or the shoe trust are giving their money to help elect a supposed and self-proclaimed friend of the people. Let the hungry man whose family has been denied meat by the greatly increased price know before he determines his choice whether the meat trust is financing one of the candidates. (Applause.) Let them have this information, and thus enlightened, let them vote, remembering that Bible truth that neither parties nor men can serve both God and Mammon. When you publish after election, why do you do it? It is for the people that they may see who contributed; yet they are then without a remedy, except to wait two, four, or six years to get at the candidate. The wrong has been done and the information is ineffective. Let the bill be a publicity bill in reality, and whether the amount contributed is sufficient to buy a king's ransom or is a widow's mite, publish it to the world. (Applause.) If the money is tainted, do not take it, but if you take it, have the courage to say that you took it. (Applause.)

My friend from Michigan said that this measure was never thought of except by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Rucker). I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is the democratic mind in this country that invents legislation in the interest of the people. (Applause.) I would also call his attention to the fact that it was in the democratic national platform of 1908 that we declared for publicity of campaign funds before the election. (Applause.) Here is what we said:

PUBLICITY OF CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

"We demand federal legislation forever terminating the partnership which has existed between corporations of the country and the republican party under the expressed or implied agreement that in return for the contribution of great sums of money wherewith to purchase elections they should be allowed to continue substantially unmolested in their efforts to encroach upon the

"Any reasonable doubt as to the existence of this relation has been dispelled by the sworn testimony of witnesses examined in the insurance investigation in New York, and the open admission of a single individual—unchallenged by the republican national committee—that he himself, at the personal request of the then republican candidate for the presidency, raised over a quarter of a million of dollars to be used in a single state during the closing hours of the last campaign. In order that this practice shall be stopped for all time we demand the passage of a statute punishing by imprisonment any officer of a corporation who shall either contribute on behalf of, or consent to the contribution by, a corporation of any money or thing of value to be used in furthering the election of a president or vice president of the United States or any member of the congress thereof.

"We denounce the republican party baying com-

"We denounce the republican party, having complete control of the federal government, for its failure to pass the bill, introduced in the last congress, to compel the publication of the names of contributors and the amounts contributed toward campaign funds, and point to the evidence of the sincerity of republican leaders when they sought, by an absolutely irrelevant and impossible amendment, to defeat the passage of the bill. As a further evidence of their intention to conduct their campaign in the coming contest with vast sums of money wrested from favor-seeking corporations we call attention to the fact that the recent republican national convention at Chicago refused, when the issue was presented to it, to declare against such practices.

"We pledge the democratic party to the enactment of a law prohibiting any corporation from contributing to a campaign fund and any individual from contributing any amount above a reasonable maximum, and providing for the publication, before election, of all such contributions above a reasonable maximum."

Mr. Speaker, no one can doubt the wisdom and justice of this platform declaration. Corporations are created by law. They are given certain rights, privileges, and exemptions that do not belong to individuals, and they should not be permitted to contribute a single dollar to any candidate or party, because, when they do so, it is done for the evident purpose of selfish ends, for special privileges, for undue advantages; and when a citizen contributes he may claim and say that he was actuated by

patriotism, by love of country, but the party that takes his money ought to be willing to publish it before the election and he ought not to be ashamed himself to have it done, and the size of his contribution ought to be limited by law. If they are actuated by honest motives and just purposes, no reasonable objection can be made to them.

Let our motto be, "Take the people into your confidence." You make your platforms before election. You do this because you want to appeal to the honest judgment of the voters. You make your promises to them; you ought to be willing to turn on the light; let the people see if there is any behind-the-scene agreement. Let them know who are interested in your success. Let them know if you are promising something in the platform to the people and behind the scene dealing with their oppressors. Be in the open. If you promise to destroy the trusts in your platform, publish the names of those who are supplying you with money to run your campaign. Let them see if the trusts are contributors. Let the people see. Do you want to retain the confidence of the people and the money of the vested interests at the same time? Which would have been the best barometer to have determined in the last campaign of 1908, whether you were going to revise the tariff downward in the interest of the consumer, your platform promise, or your campaign contributors. The people would not have been fooled by the republican party if they could have seen your campaign contribution list before the election. Yet, it is too late now, the tariff is revised upward in the interest of the favored few instead of downward in the interest of the consumer; prices are soaring, every necessity of life is going by leaps and bounds higher. We have to wait until another election. The vested interests are safely intrenched. The schedules they desired in the tariff bill have been written. The people are paying the bill.

The republicans promised, of course, that they would revise the tariff, and some of them point to the fact that they have kept that promise. They seemingly honestly urge that the word "revise" meant exactly what they did to the tariff, for they point out that revised is derived from two Latin words—re, meaning again, and visum, seen. They innocently say they saw the tariff again and therefore "revised" it. This, according to this sophistry, is doubtless true. They saw it again, but they raised it so high that nobody else has been able to see it since they passed the Payne-Aldrich bill.

Mr. Gaines. Will you permit an inquiry?
Mr. James. If you will give a minute additional to reply.

Mr. Gaines. I will give you a minute to reply if you want it. Is there any state in the union, save Oklahoma, which requires the publication of campaign contributions before election? Is it not a fact that even the democratic legislature in Kentucky never suggested the proposition for which you now contend?

Mr. James. It does not matter whether a state in the union has done it or has not. You must meet the issue, Is it right or wrong? That is the way to meet the issue, not by saying no state has it. We are legislating for the whole people. (Applause.) Let us start the march of reform; let us set an example for others to follow. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are demanding that the power of money shall be curbed. If we had this publicity measure upon the statute books, the moment the voter knew that the oil trust, the meat trust, and the steel trust and the wool trust had made a contribution to the republican campaign fund he might, with some wisdom, determine whether you would keep your promise to revise the tariff in the interest of the consumer. But you provide that after that election, after the election has been bought, after the candidate has gotten his seat, and that after those whose tenure of office is from two to six years have been successfully placed in their respective offices, then when all is quiet and nobody affected by it the publication shall be made of campaign expenses. The power of money "sed by combinations, trusts, and monopolies, Mr. Speaker, is undermining this republic. us the light of publicity which we need before election. I would warn you of the mighty truth that republics live only in the light. It is only darkness that fosters socialism and disorder. Let the torch of publicity light our national highway. Let men or parties take their choice between the money of the designing rich and the ballots of the honest poor. Let us raise the battle flag of honest elections. Let the voter be unbought, unafraid, and unfooled. (Loud applause on the democratic side.)

EMBEZZLEMENT OF POWER

The primary will soon be here, and as candidates are already entering upon their canvass, it behooves the democrats of Nebraska to know the views of those who aspire to office. We have one hundred representatives and thirty-three senators to elect to the legislature, and every candidate should be put on record upon the questions at issue. No candidate is deserving of democratic support unless he believes that a platform is binding. A platform which is not binding is a fraud upon the public, and the man who repudiates a platform after he is elected upon it is an embezzler of power.

Next to believing in platforms comes the securing of a platform that represents the wishes of the voters. On national questions the democrats of Nebraska are agreed, as they have been for more than fifteen years, but as there are differences of opinion on state issues, it is necessary that these shall be given careful consideration and that the platform on all of these questions shall be clear and specific and represent the sentiment of the voters. There is one issue to which special attention ought to be called at this time. It is the issue presented in the initiative and referendum. The sentiment in favor of this is practically unanimous among democrats, and yet in the last legislature a few democratic senators assumed the responsibility of defeating the initiative and referendum resolution. This resolution had the support of the democratic governor, of nearly all the democratic members of the house and of more than half of the democratic members of the senate, but in spite of this endorsement of a fundamental democratic doctrine, the following democratic senators voted against the resolution: Ransom, Howell, Tanner, Buck, Klein, Buhrman, Bartos, Volpp and Besse. If four of these had voted for the resolution, the amendment would have been submitted and the liquor question would not now be acute.

The democratic voters in the districts represented, or misrepresented as the case may be, by the above named senators, are to decide whether these gentlemen gave expression to the sentiment of their constituents. Since the adjournment of the legislature a democratic state convention—the convention of 1909—has unanimously endorsed the initiative and referendum, and there is no doubt that the coming state convention will do likewise. Yet in spite of this positive endorsement of this democratic reform by a state convention Senators Ransom, Howell, Tanner, Buck, Klein and Bartos recently declared that they would vote against the resolution again if a special session was called. Senator Buhrman, who voted no at the regular session, announced that if a special session was called, he would vote yes. Senators Volpp and Besse, who voted no during the first session, announced that they would vote no again unless their constituents asked them to vote yes. Senator Tibbetts, who voted yes at the regular session, refused to say how he would vote at a special session.

This issue ought to be discussed in every senatorial and legislative district, and every democratic candidate ought to be compelled to announce himself on the proposition. No man is entitled to democratic support who is not willing to allow the people to rule. If the people desire to speak directly on any question-and the initiative and referendum gives them this rightthey should have the right to do so. No democrat who has gone on record gainst the initiative and referendum should receive democratic support unless he has repented and can convince his constituents that he can be trusted to vote for the proposition at all times and under all circumstances hereafter. If a democratic official thinks that his conscience told him to vote against the initiative and referendum, he is mistaken; such suggestions do not come from that source. It is the voice of the serpent and not the voice of God that prompts a senator or representative to deny to his people the right to control their own government. None but the faithful should be put on guard at a time like this.

000000000000000000000

The American Homestead, a monthly farm journal of national scope, will be sent to all Commoner subscribers, without additional cost, who renew their subscriptions during the month of July. Take advantage of this offer at once and send in your renewal.